

### **Remarks/Arguments**

Upon entry of the accompanying amendment, claims 1-20 will be pending in this application. Claims 1-11 are rejected in the Office Action of February 2, 2007. Claims 1-11 are amended, and claims 12-20 are newly added herein.

### **Re: Abstract/Specification**

The Examiner provides remarks relating to the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure and the preferred layout for the specification in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, respectively. In response, Applicants submit a substitute specification (marked-up and clean versions) in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §§1.125(b) and (c). The substitute specification includes designated section headings and a revised abstract of the disclosure. The substitute specification includes no new matter. Applicants respectfully request that the accompanying substitute specification replace the current specification on file.

### **Re: Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to due to labeling. To rectify this matter, Applicants submit revised drawings sheets with proper labeling for Figs. 1a, 1b, 4a and 4b. This labeling corresponds to the drawing designations included in the substitute specification. In view of the revised drawings sheets and substitute specification, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

### **Re: Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. To rectify this matter, various claim amendments are included with this response to specifically address each of the issues raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments, all claims are deemed definite and allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Re: Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1225516 to Jahnke et al. (hereinafter, "Jahnke") in view of WO 01/42881 to Dodds et al. (hereinafter, "Dodds"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants first note that independent claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended herein to recite the following feature:

"wherein the information describing the descriptor structure includes an indicator for a hierarchical level of at least one of the portions of the plurality of common formats within the descriptors, and an indicator for a position of a next upper hierarchical portion of the plurality of common formats within the descriptors."

The foregoing feature of the claimed invention has the advantage that by indicating an hierarchical level of a portion of the plurality of comment formats as well as a position of a next upper hierarchical portion of the plurality of common formats, it becomes easily possible to recover a part of a descriptor when only the position of a portion of a common format is known (e.g. as a query result).

Neither Jahnke nor Dodds, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the foregoing feature of the claimed invention. On page 5 of the Office Action dated February 2, 2007, the Examiner admits that Jahnke fails to teach a descriptor structure that includes an indicator for the next upper hierarchical level of a portion of a common format within the descriptors, and relies on Dodds for allegedly teaching such a feature (citing the Abstract and page 18, lines 16-19 thereof). However, the proposed combination of Jahnke and Dodds fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed feature of "wherein the information describing the descriptor structure includes an indicator for a hierarchical level of at least one of the portions of the plurality of common formats within the descriptors, and an indicator for a position of a next upper hierarchical portion of the plurality of common formats within the descriptors" recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 11. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are

deemed allowable over the proposed combination of Jahnke and Dodds and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Newly Added Claims 12-20**

Claims 12-20 are newly added herein to further define independent claims 10 and 11. Newly added claims 12-20 are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons stated above in conjunction with claims 1-11.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks/arguments, Applicant believes that this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6813, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled. No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

  
By: Reitseng Lin  
Reg. No. 42,804  
Phone (609) 734-6813

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08540  
April 23, 2007

### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

4-23-07  
Date

Karen Schleich